UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,791	05/28/2004	Sreekumar K. SESHADRI	ORCL-004/OID-2003-265-01	3790

51121   7590   12/10/2008
LAW FIRM OF NAREN THAPPETA
C/o Landon-IP Inc.,
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 450
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER
KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/709,791	SESHADRI, SREEKUMAR K.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SIMON KE	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-10,12-22 and 27-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4, 6-10, 12-22 and 27-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   **Office Action Summary**   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20081207

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 8/29/08.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-22 and 27-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 14, and

28 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-22 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Craycroft et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0149629) in

view of Novak et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101444) and Stucks et al

(US Patent No. 5,596,702).

Regarding independent claim 1, Craycroft teaches a method of enabling a user to have a

custom desired experience while accessing electronic files using an application, each electronic

file storing corresponding data, each electronic file storing corresponding data, said method

comprising:

providing said user the ability to specify a first experience profile associated with a first

electronic file, (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft; also compare "Look and Feel" of

desktop in FIGS. 2D and 2E et seq. of Craycroft), said first experience profile being provided

external to said first electronic file (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C control files such as "untitled 2" in

FIGS. 2A and 2B et seq. of Craycroft), said first experience profile containing a first set of

values for a first set of experience attributes; controlling said first set of experience attributes

according to said first set of values while providing access to the data stored in said first

electronic file using said application storing a first entry indicating that said first user first

experience profile is associated with said first electronic file, first electronic file, fist entry is

store and load from memory (i.e. Font, Icon and List views in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft).

Craycroft does not teach a second experience profile containing a second set of values

for a second set of experience attributes associated with and for controlling a second electronic

file.

Novak teaches a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second

set of experience attributes associated with a second electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et

seq. of Novak). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate

the flexibility of different skins with different files of Novak into the custom experience of

Craycroft. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Novak into Craycroft to create a

different look for various applications and user interfaces (i.e. see [0003] et seq. of Novak).

Stucks teaches a second set of values for controlling a second electronic file and second

entry indicating that said second experience profile is associated with said second elect5ronic

file, second entry is store and load from memory (col. 10, lines 1-45).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the

control of a second file of Stucks into the custom experience of Craycroft as modified by Novak.

Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Stucks into the modified Craycroft to give a

greater degree of control over the interface through file and application interaction.

Regarding dependent claim 2, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: providing said user the ability to specify said first experience profile associated with a third electronic file; and controlling said first set of experience attributes according to said first set of values while providing access to said third electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak, also compare change in theme in FIGS. 2C-2E et seq. of Craycroft).

Regarding dependent claim 3, see the analysis of claim 2 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising setting said first set of experience attribute to respective ones of said first set of values as specified in said first experience profile to change the experience while accessing the respective data stored in each of said first electronic file and said third electronic file, but not while accessing the data stored in said second electronic file said second electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak, also compare change in theme in FIGS. 2C-2E et seq. of Craycroft).

Regarding dependent claim 4, see the analysis of claim 3 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 3, wherein said first set of values is not the same as said second set of values and wherein said first set of experience attributes is not the same as said second set of experience attributes (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak, also compare change in theme in FIGS. 2C-2E et seq. of Craycroft).

Regarding dependent claim 6, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Craycroft in combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said first of experience attributes comprises a shape of a cursor (i.e. [0034] et seq. of Craycroft: "control the appearance of ... cursors").

Regarding dependent claim 7, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said first electronic file comprises a document which can be edited using said application and wherein said first set of experience attributes indicates a music file to be played, said controlling said frist set of experience attributes comprising playing music represented by said music file using another application while enabling editing of said document using said application where said document is opened from editing and also said music file is play in response to receiving said first open request (i.e. compare song list in Fig. 14 with Figs. 18-21 and steps 1202-1204 in Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding dependent claim 8, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said application is executed on a system supported by an operating system, wherein said application and said operating system respectively support an application default and an operating system default, wherein said first set of values override said application default and said operating system default if in conflict (i.e. "Apple Default" in FIG. 11 et seq. of Craycroft).

Wherein said operating system default, said application default said first experience profile respectively specifies a first value, a second value and third value for a first attribute. (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said first attribute is contained in said first set of attributes and said third vlaue is contained in said first set of values, (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said controlling controls said first attribute according to said third value while providing access to the data stored in said first electronic file using said application. (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said operating system default and said application default respectively specifies a fourth value and a fifth value for a second attribute, and said first experience profile does not specify a value for said second attribute, (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said second attribute is contained in said first set of attributes. (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said controlling controls said second attribute according to said fifth value while providing access to the data stored in said first electronic file using said application, (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said operating system default specifies a sixth value for a third attribute, and neither of said first experience profile nor said application default specify corresponding value for said third attribute, (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said third attribute is contained in said first set of attributes, (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said operating system default, said application default, said first experience profile and said first electronic file respectively specifies a seventh value, a eight value, a ninth value, and a tenth value for a fourth attribute. (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Wherein said controlling controls said third attribute according to said sixth value while providing access to the data stored in said first electronic file using said application, whereby

values provided in said operating system default, said application default and said first

experience profile are over ridence in that order. (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

Regarding dependent claim 9, see the analysis of claim 5 above. Craycroft, in

combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said providing

comprises: displaying on a display unit a plurality of experience profiles available for association

with electronic files, wherein said plurality of experience profiles comprising said first

experience profile and said second experience profile; and receiving a selection from said user

based on the display on said display unit, wherein said selection indicates that said first

experience profile is to be associated with said first electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-21 and

steps 1202-1204 in Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak).

Wherein controlling provides access to the data stored in said first electronic file

according to said first experience profile in response to receiving said selection. (see Stucks, col.

10, lines 1-45)

Regarding independent claim 10, Craycroft teaches a method of enabling a user to have a

custom desired experience while accessing a first electronic file using a first application, said

method comprising: enabling said user to specify an experience attribute associated with said

first application and a value for said experience attribute (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C et seq. of

Craycroft). Craycroft does not teach a second experience profile containing a second set of

values for a second set of experience attributes associated with and for controlling a second

electronic file.

Novak teaches a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second

set of experience attributes associated with a second electronic file opening said first electronic

file using a word process application enable said user edit a substantial portion of playing said

song alaos in responseto receiving said input, wherein said song is played also in response to said

specifying said experience attribute associated with said electronic file(i.e. compare Figs. 18-22

et seq. of Novak). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to

integrate the flexibility of different skins with different files of Novak into the custom experience

of Craycroft. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Novak into Craycroft to create

a different look for various applications and user interfaces (i.e. see [0003] et seq. of Novak).

Stucks teaches a second set of values for controlling a second electronic file; receiving an

input to open saif first electronic files; providing access to the data stored in said first electonric

file using said first application in response to receiving said input(see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the control of a

second file of Buxton into the custom experience of Stucks as modified by Novak. Said artisan

would have been motivated to combine Stucks into the modified Craycroft to give a greater

degree of control over the interface through file and application interaction.

Regarding dependent claim 11, see the analysis of claim 10 above. Craycroft, in

combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 10, said first application

comprises a word processing application and said first electronic file comprises a editable file,

whereby said second application plays said song while said user edits said editable file using said

first application. (i.e. "application" in FIG. 4 seq. of Stucks), and wherein said second application

is designed to play a song from a file, and said value comprises an identifier of said file (i.e. songs in Fig. 14 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding dependent claim 12, see the analysis of claim 11 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 11, wherein said user can specify a second experience attribute associated with first electronic file, wherein said second experience attribute controls a volume of said song (i.e. compare song list and volume control in Fig. 14 with Figs. 18-21 and steps 1202-1204 in Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding dependent claim 13, see the analysis of claim 12 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Stucks teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said first experience attribute and said second experience attribute are specified in an experience profile associated with said first electronic file (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak).

Regarding independent claim 14, Craycroft teaches a computer readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions causing a digital processing system to enable a user to have a custom desired experience while accessing electronic files using an application, wherein execution of said one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors contained in said digital processing system causes said one or more processors to perform the actions of: providing said user the ability to specify a first experience profile associated with a first electronic file controlling said first set of experience attributes according to said first set of values while providing access to the data stored in said first electronic file using said application storing a first entry indicating that said first user first experience profile is associated with said first electronic file, first electronic file, fist entry is store and load from memory (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft), said first experience profile being provided external to said first

electronic file (i.e. "Views" in FIG. 2C control files such as "untitled 2" in FIGS. 2A and 2B et seq. of Craycroft), said first experience profile containing a first set of values for a first set of experience attributes; controlling said first set of experience attributes according to said first set of values while providing access to said first electronic file using said application (i.e. Font, Icon and List views in FIG. 2C et seq. of Craycroft). Craycroft does not teach a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with and for controlling a second electronic file.

Novak teaches a second experience profile containing a second set of values for a second set of experience attributes associated with and controlling a second electronic file (i.e. "related files for a skin" in step 1200 of Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the flexibility of different skins with different files of Novak into the custom experience of Craycroft. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Novak into Craycroft to create a different look for various applications and user interfaces (i.e. see [0003] et seq. of Novak).

Stucks teaches a second set of values for controlling a second electronic file storing corresponding data and second entry indicating that said second experience profile is associated with said second elect5ronic file, second entry is store and load from memory (see Stucks, col. 10, lines 1-45)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the control of a second file of Stucks into the custom experience of Craycroft as modified by Novak. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Stucks into the modified Craycroft to give a greater degree of control over the interface through file and application interaction.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 2, differing primarily in that claim 15 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 2 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 3, differing primarily in that claim 16 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 3 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 4, differing primarily in that claim 17 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 4 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 5, differing primarily in that claim 18 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 5 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 6, differing primarily in that claim 19 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 6 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 7, differing primarily in that claim 20 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 7 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 8, differing primarily in that claim 21 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 8 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 9, differing primarily in that claim 22 is directed towards a computer readable medium and claim 9 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 27, Craycroft, Novak, and Stucks teach the method of claim 5. Craycroft teaches storing stores said association information in a non-volatile memory. (see Craycroft, paragraph; 0012)

As per claim 29, Craycroft, Novak, and Stucks teach the method of claim 8. Stucks further teaches said first electronic file specifies a seventh value for a fourth attribute internal to said first electronic file, (see Stucks. Col. 11, lines 40- col. 12, lines 35)

Said operating system default, said application default and said first experience profile respectively specifies a eight value, a ninth value and a tenth value for said fourth attribute, (see Stucks. Col. 11, lines 40- col. 12, lines 35)

Where in said fourth attribute is contained in said first set of attributes and said thenth value is contained in said first set of values, (see Stucks. Col. 11, lines 40- col. 12, lines 35)

Wherein said controlling controls said fourth attribute according to said seventh value while providing access to the data stored in said first electronic file using said application, (see Stucks. Col. 11, lines 40- col. 12, lines 35)

Whereby values provided in said operating system default, said application default said first experience profile and those provided internal to said first electronic file are overridden in that order. (see Stucks. Col. 11, lines 40- col. 12, lines 35)

As per claims 29 and 30, they rejected under the same rationale as claims 8 and 28. Supra.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/29/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argument focused on the following:

Whether the combination of Craycroft, Novak, and Struck teach associating different profile with different files?

Struck teaches this limitation because user can difference user profile interface with different application file. (see Struck, col. 8, lines 25-col. 9, lines 25)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke
/Peng   Ke/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174